



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,759	01/30/2001	Ashok Kumar	00-5016	9443
32127	7590 11/18/2004	,	EXAMINER	
<b>VERIZON</b>	CORPORATE SERVICES	CHUONG, TRUC T		
	TIAN R. ANDERSEN NRIDGE DRIVE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MAILCODE HQEO3H14 IRVING, TX 75038			2179	
			DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
· j	09/772,759	KUMAR ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Truc T Chuong	2179				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Ju	<u>uly 2004</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☐ This	,					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-51</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	ef.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
, , ,	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• •					
application from the International Bureau	•					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)	" <b></b> "	(270, 440)				
I) ⊠ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)    Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 07/19/04.
- 2. Claims 1-51 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 21, 32, and 38 are independent claims. In the Amendment, claims 1, 7, 10, 18, 21, 29, 32, 35, 38, and are amended, and claims 47-51 are new claims. This action is made final.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 10-11, 13-15, 19-22, 24-26, 30-32, 36-41, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Austin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,500,934).

As to claim 1, Austin teaches a method of presenting to a user a visual representation of a frame laid out in a matrix of blocks laid out in a matrix of pins, the frame resident at a central office of a telecommunications system, the method comprising:

accessing a database including data as to a current condition of the frame (a visual image of hardware models, e.g., col. 5 lines 40-50, col. 11 lines 20-33, and figs. 5, 11, 13, 14 & 16), the data including data indicating which pins in the frame are currently in use and which pins in the frame are available for use (e.g., col. 11 lines 38-54, col. 13 lines 49-67, and figs. 5 and 16 show pins/slots/connectors/jacks are in use and "?" of fig. 5 and "disconnect from" of fig. 16 are still available);

displaying, based on the accessed data, a graphical representation of the frame, the graphical representation including a visual indication of the current condition of the frame including a visual indication of a plurality of pins currently in use and a visual indication of a plurality of pins available for user (e.g., col. 11 lines 38-54, col. 13 lines 49-67, and figs. 5 and 16); and

allowing a user to interface with the graphical representation to effect a mapping between available pins on the frame and telecommunications lines leading to and from the frame (e.g., col. 8 lines 20-50, and fig. 3).

As to claim 2, Austin teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the displaying step displays the graphical representation of the frame in response to the user specifying a particular frame from a particular central office in the telecommunications system (e.g., col. 13 line 49-col. 14 line 24).

As to claim 3, Austin teaches a method according to claim 2, wherein the frame is made up of constituent blocks and the displaying step may display a particular block from a specified frame in response to the user's entry of coordinates for the block (When individual port 162 is selected, screen graphics 132 of FIG. 15, illustrating the selectable async port parameters, is displayed as indicated in FIG. 8C, e.g., col. 14 lines 5-7).

As to claim 4, Austin teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the allowing step further allows the user to modify attributes of the selected frame (Once a connection is selected, all the associated parameters and/or pictographic connection data is displayed for user review/modification. This is shown in FIG. 7. Users repeat this until all connectivity is defined.

Application/Control Number: 09/772,759

Art Unit: 2179

As each new connectivity option is defined, the connectivity summary screen is updated, e.g., col. 11 lines 59-64).

As to claim 8, Austin teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of allowing the user to add a new frame at a selected central office of the telecommunications system (Add New Connection, e.g., col. 11 lines 53-58).

As to claim 9, Austin teaches a method according to claim 8, wherein the user can specify a number of modules, shelves, and blocks per shelf for an added new frame (The hardware view of the personal computer and its associated slots immediately demonstrates to the user the maximum number of interface cards possible (in this case, seven), the number currently configured (in this case, seven), as well as the installed card types, e.g., col. 13 lines 49-65).

As to claim 10, this is a program product claim of method claim 1. Note the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claim 11, Austin teaches a program storage device according to claim 10, wherein the code further comprises the database interface code, and the database interface code comprises a common gateway interface (CGI) application (The OpenView and Node Manager utilizes free-form graphics for representing each node in the network and its various interconnections with the remaining nodes in the network. The representation of each network element may be positioned anywhere on the computer screen by the user and, at any time, be selected for a display of the element's network interconnect status. IBM's LAN Network Manager employs a similar free-form graphical representation of the network for monitoring purposes, e.g., col. 2 lines 36-44).

As to claims 13-15, they are program product claims of method claims 2-4. Note the rejections of claims 2-4 above respectively.

As to claims 19-20, they are program product claims of method claims 8-9. Note the rejections of claims 8-9 above respectively.

As to claims 21-22, they are system claims of program product claims 10-11. Note the rejections of claims 10-11 above respectively.

As to claims 24-26, they are system claims of program product claims 13-15. Note the rejections of claims 13-15 above respectively.

As to claims 30-31, they are system claims of program product claims 19-20. Note the rejections of claims 19-20 above respectively.

As to claim 32, it is similar in scope to claim 1; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

As to claims 36-37, they are similar in scopes to claims 8-9 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationales.

As to claims 38-41, they are apparatus claims of method claims 1-4. Note the rejections of claims 1-4 above respectively.

As to claims 45-46, they are apparatus claims of method claims 8-9. Note the rejections of claims 8-9 above respectively.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-7, 16-18, 27-29, 33-35, 42-44, and 47-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,500,934) in view of MacPhail (U.S. Patent No. 6,597,377 B1).

As to claim 5, Austin teaches a method according to claim 1, wherein the graphical representation of the frame displayed at the displaying step (note the rejection of claim 1 above); however, Austin does not teach the display step includes a first Web page showing a frame of a selected central office laid out as a matrix of constituent blocks. MacPhail clearly teaches a set of objects on a computer network, such as web pages, which are interrelated by links between the objects, and a set of pages (web site) dealing with technical support for a particular computer hardware system (e.g., col. 2 lines 21-29, 55-65, and figs. 2-3). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to have the Website displayed features of MacPhail in the visual image network of Austin for easier monitoring and access of multiple hardware located at anywhere in the Network System.

As to claim 6, the modified Austin teaches a method according to claim 5, wherein the graphical representation of the frame is displayed at the displaying step (note the rejection of claim 1 above); however, Austin does not teach the displaying step includes a second Web page showing available pins on any block in the matrix, and allows the user to search for a block having a number of available pins entered by the user. MacPhail clearly teaches hierarchical levels of links to display on a Website in details each of the Network element and its relationships (e.g., col. 4 lines 3-52 and fig. 3). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention that a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to use the detailed Website

Application/Control Number: 09/772,759

Art Unit: 2179

displayed features of MacPhail in the visual image network of Austin to provide better ways to navigate the Network System with an appropriate reaction if there is any change to it.

As to claim 7, modified Austin teaches a method according to claim 6, wherein the allowing step allows the user to assign a jumper from a port on a switching card to an available pin (e.g., col. 11 lines 16-41, and figs. 13 & 16).

As to claims 16-18, they are program product claims of method claims 5-7. Note the rejections of claims 5-7 above respectively.

As to claims 27-29, they are system claims of program product claims 16-18. Note the rejections of claims 16-18 above respectively.

As to claims 33-35, they are similar in scopes to claims 5-7 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationales.

As to claims 42-44, they are apparatus claims of method claims 5-7. Note the rejections of claims 5-7 above respectively.

As to claim 47, Austin teaches a method according to claim 6, wherein the allowing step allows the user to assign a jumper form an available pin to an outside plant feeder (e.g., col. 8 lines 20-47, and fig. 3).

As to claim 48, it is a program product claim of method claim 47. Note the rejection of claim 47 above.

As to claim 49, it is a system claim of the program product claim 48. Note the rejection of claim 48 above.

As to claim 50, it is similar in scope to claim 48 above; therefore, rejected under similar rationale.

Application/Control Number: 09/772,759

Art Unit: 2179

Page 8

As to claim 51, it is an apparatus claim of the method claim 47. Note the rejection of claim 47 above.

7. Claims 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,500,934) in view of Fields et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,581,109 B1).

As to claim 12, Austin teaches a program storage device according to claim 10, wherein the code further comprises the database interface code (The viewbox acts as a mechanism to allow the user to access relevant details associated with any given box. In the present application, the boxes represent local area network (LAN) to LAN wide area network (WAN) program servers (LTLWs) such as personal computers running such programs, e.g., col. 7 lines 1-7); however, Austin does not teach the database interface code comprises a Java servlet. Fields clearly teaches of using a Java servlet in his invention. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention, a person with ordinary skill in the art would want to utilize the Java servlet of Fields in the visual image network of Austin to be able to run Java code from a server to improve performance.

As to claim 23, it is a system claim of program product claim 12. Note the rejection of claim 12 above.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kekic et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,179) teaches real visual images of computer network, status, connectors, frames, hubs, ports, www, Java, configuration, and GUI (cols. 5-96 and figs. 3B-38B).

Brown et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,606,664) teaches hubs, ports, frames, mapping, network monitoring, connectivity, visual images, and control console (cols. 1-25 and figs. 1-3, 7-9, and 10).

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 571-272-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

11/12/04

BAHUYNH MARYEXAMINEB